



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/507,050	09/08/2004	Gunnar Rydnell	P16558-US2	8785
27045	7590	09/24/2007		
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			EXAMINER PEREZ, ANGELICA	
			ART UNIT 2618	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/24/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/507,050

Applicant(s)

RYDNELL ET AL.

Examiner

Perez M. Angelica

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Rejection under 35 USC § 112 has been withdrawn. Note: since the Protocol 802.11i has not been released (at the time of filing of the application), the first release will be considered. Any further releases/versions will not apply due to the changes that it might present.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry (Henry et al.; Pub. No.: US 2003/0,172,144 A1) in view of Immonen (Immonen et al.; US Patent No.: 7,010,305 B2) and further in view of Luo, Hui (Luo, US 20030169713A1).

Regarding claim 4, Henry teaches of wireless access point (AP) operative to perform authentication for both legacy and 802.11i wireless stations (paragraph 7), where: if an 802.11i wireless station is encountered by the AP, the AP performs a 802.11i association and authentication (paragraph 48; where authentication for 802.11i stations as well as 802.11 wireless stations takes place corresponding to host and regular stations).

Henry does not specifically teach where if a legacy wireless station is encountered by the AP, the wireless station initiates a login procedure with a Public Access Control gateway (PAC).

In related art concerning a method for assigning values of service attributes to transmissions, radio access networks and network elements, Immonen teaches where if a legacy wireless station is encountered by the AP, wireless station initiates a login procedure with a Public Access Control gateway (PAC) (columns 8 and 9, lines 62-67 and 1-10, respectively; column 12, lines 12-17 and column 13, line 43-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Henry's access control method with Immonen's logging with a PAC in order to maintain flow control of authorized users, as taught by Immonen. In addition, both references deal with authentication of differing protocols.

Henry and Immonen do not specifically teach where an 802.1x enabled switch is accessed for the 802.11i wireless station and traffic from the 802.11i wireless station passes through the switch without filtering.

Luo teaches where an 802.1x enabled switch is accessed for the 802.11i wireless station and traffic from the 802.11i wireless station passes through the switch without filtering (paragraph 12, where once the protocol is implemented, there is no need for filtering since the protocol provides high security).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Henry's and Immonen's access control method with

Luo's implementation of the new protocol in order to avoid filtering while enhancing security.

Regarding claim 6, Henry, Immonen and Luo teach all the limitations according to claim 5. Henry further teaches where the AP waits for a message from the PAC indicative of successful authorization of the legacy 802.11x wireless station and, once received, allows traffic to and from the legacy 802.11x wireless station without filtering (Paragraphs 36-37 and 48; where once the device is authorized, authenticated, it does not require filtering).

Regarding claim 5, Henry, Immonen and Luo teach all the limitations according to claim 4.

Immonen further teaches where if a legacy 802.11x wireless station is encountered, in order to accomplish login, a PAC timer is set and traffic is forwarded by the AP to and from the PAC using encapsulation (column 12, lines 36-60), and transmitting a message from the AP to the PAC indicating that the wireless station needs authentication (column 12, lines 36-60; where it is one of the protocols procedures).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Henry 's, Immonen's and Luo's access control method with Immonen's further teachings about authentication and encapsulation in order to maintain control of authorized users, as taught by Immonen.

Luo further teaches of a PAC operative to transmit a web based login page to the legacy wireless station (paragraph 10, where the PAC's procedure is a standard authentication of 801.11 standards).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

1. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Angelica Perez whose telephone number is 571-272-7885. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m., Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew D. Anderson can be reached on (571) 272-4177. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and for After Final communications.


Art Unit: 2618

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either the PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through the Private PAIR only. For more information about the pair system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Information regarding Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system can be found at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2600's customer service number is 703-306-0377.



Angelica Perez
Examiner



MATTHEW ANDERSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Art Unit 2618

September 14, 2007